CRITICAL APPRAISAL CHECKLIST FOR AN ARTICLE ON QUALITATIVE RESEARCH.

Study Design: This is a generic checklist covering different types of qualitative research methodology, e.g. interviews, focus groups

Adapted from:

Critical Appraisal Skills Programme (CASP), Public Health Resource Unit, Institute of Health Science, Oxford.

Greenhalgh T. Papers that go beyond numbers (qualitative research). In: *How to read a paper. The basics of evidence based medicine.* BMJ Publishing Group, 1997.

Dept. of General Practice
University of Glasgow.

IS THIS PAPER WORTH READING?

	Yes	Can't tell	No
1. Did the article describe an important clinical problem addressed via a clearly formulated question?			
2. Was a qualitative approach appropriate? Consider: • Does the research seek to understand or illuminate the experiences and/or views of those taking part.			

ARE THE RESULTS CREDIBLE?

	Yes	Can't tell	No
3. Was the sampling strategy clearly defined and justified? In particular, Consider: • Has the method of sampling (for both the subjects and the setting) been adequately described? • Have the investigators studied the most useful or productive range of individuals and settings relevant to their question? • Have the characteristics of the subjects been defined? • Is it clear why some participants chose not to take part?			
4. What methods did the researcher use for collecting data? Consider: • Have appropriate data sources been studied? • Have the methods used for data collection been described in enough detail? • Was more than one method of data collection used? • Were the methods used reliable and independently verifiable (e.g. audiotape, videotape, fieldnotes)? • Were observations taken in a range of circumstances (e.g. at different times)?			

	Yes	Can't tell	No
5. What methods did the researcher use to analyse the data, and what quality control measures were implemented? Consider: • How were themes and concepts derived from the data? • Did more than one researcher perform the analysis, and what method was used to resolve differences of interpretation? • Were negative or discrepant results fully addressed, or just ignored?			
6. Was the relationship between the researcher(s) and participant(s) explicit. Consider: • What was the researchers perspective? • Had the researcher critically examined his or her own role, potential bias and influence? • Was it clear where the data were collected and why that setting was chosen? • How was the research explained to the participants? • Confidentiality, ethics, implications and consequences for research findings for all of the above.			

WHAT ARE THE RESULTS?

	Yes	Can't tell	No
7. What are the results, and do they address the research question?			
8. Are the results credible? For example, • Have sequences from the original data been included in the paper (e.g. direct quotation)? • Is it possible to determine the source of data presented (e.g. by numbering of extracts)? • How much of the information collected is available for independent assessment? • Are the explanations presented plausible and coherent?			

9. What conclusions were drawn, and are they justified by the results? In particular, have alternative explanations for the results been explored?			

ARE THE FINDINGS OF THIS STUDY TRANSFERABLE TO A WIDER POPULATION?

	Yes	**Can't tell**	**No**
10. To what extent are the findings of the study transferable to other clinical settings? Consider: • Were the subjects in the study similar in important respects to your own patients? • Is the context similar to your own practice?			